

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,497	11/19/2003	Peter Franke	5369	4505
26936 7	590 06/08/2004		EXAMINER	
SHOEMAKER AND MATTARE, LTD 10 POST OFFICE ROAD - SUITE 110			WRIGHT, ANDREW D	
	NG, MD 20910		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3617	
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	li li			
10/715,497	FRANKE, PETER	X			
Examiner	Art Unit				
Andrew Wright	3617				
ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addres	SS			
86(a). In no event, however, may a re or within the statutory minimum of thirt vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commu ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
action is non-final.					
 This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
wn from consideration. r election requirement.					
drawing(s) be held in abeyar ion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	.121(d).			
s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	ge			
Paper No(: 5) Notice of I	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)			
	Examiner Andrew Wright Pears on the cover sheet wi Also SET TO EXPIRE 3 Miles (a). In no event, however, may a received in the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON (cause the application to become AB adate of this communication, even if the except for formal matters parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. And from consideration. The except for formal matters are accepted or by accepted or by accepted or by accepted or by accepted in abeyar ion is required if the drawing carminer. Note the attached arity documents have been received. So have been received in Accepted and the priority under 35 U.S.C. So shave been received in Accepted (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). Of the certified copies not the certified copies not the certified copies of the certified certified copies of the cert	Examiner And Unit Andrew Wright Basers on the cover sheet with the correspondence address As IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM Basers on the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely, within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U. S.C. § 133). Indee except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except for formal matters, prosecution as to the metal except formal matters, prosecution as to the metal			

Application/Control Number: 10/715,497

Art Unit: 3617

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1, 2, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable 2. over Frost (US 933,426) in view of Landes et al. (US 3,208,421). Frost shows a hull with a bow and stern. Edges identified by reference number (11) in figure 6 are the cutting edges. They slope rearward, downwardly, and in an outward direction form the bow. Side edges are edges (13). They extend longitudinally rearward from a cutting edge. The edge (13) will necessarily have some degree of curvature due to the manufacturing of the sidewall of which it is part. Since the claim does not specify an amount or relative degree of curvature, the curvature of the edge (13), regardless how minute, meets the broad limitation of the claim. Sidewalls (12) extend up from the cutting edges and side edges. Channel (14) is formed between the side edges at the bow and extends toward the stern. The channel decreases in width (thickness) until point (15) where the bottom of the hull is substantially flat. Frost does not disclose that the sidewall form a rounded V-shaped section from the point where the side edges meet extending rearward toward the stern. Landes shows a hull with a channel that extends from the bow rearward. The channel transitions into a V-shape that extends toward the stern. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Application/Control Number: 10/715,497

Art Unit: 3617

time the invention was made to modify Frost by making the hull at (15) a V-shape instead of flat. The motivation would be to optimize hydrodynamic performance parameters of the hull. Frost does not associate any criticality with the flat bottom surface at (15) and it is well known and common to experiment with hull shapes for the purpose of optimizing hydrodynamic performance for an intended use. Furthermore, V-shaped hulls are extremely well known in the art. Therefore, using Frost as a starting point and Landes as a teaching, it would be within the scope of routine experimentation to change the flat bottom (15) to a V-shape.

- 3. Regarding claim 2, Landes shows that the V-shape extends rearward and upward toward the stern.
- 4. Regarding claim 9, Landes shows a hydrofoil (R) extending form the stern. It is well known and common to provide hulls with a rudder hydrofoil for steering the hull in the water. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Frost by adding a rudder at the stern.
- 5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost in view of Landes as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baker (Us 1,189,227). Frost in view of Landes does not show that the sidewalls spiral. Baker shows a hull with a bottom that transitions between a channel and a V-shape. Baker shows that the sidewalls spiral from outward (figure 3) to vertical (figure 7) to inward (figure 9). Again, it is common practice for hull designers to experiment with hull shape parameters for the purpose of optimizing the hull hydrodynamic performance for an intended use. Frost

Art Unit: 3617

shows outward slanted sidewalls (12). Using Frost as a starting point and Baker as a teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Frost by making the walls spiral form outward, to vertical, to inward as taught by Baker. The motivation would be to experiment with performance-effecting parameters of the hull.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Andrade, Jr. ('876) shows numerous different hull shapes thereby suggesting experimentation. Garmont ('183) shows a hull that transitions from a channel to a flat surface. Oskolsky et al. ('717) shows a hull with rounded side edges and a bottom that transitions form a channel to a rounded V-shape, to a flat bottom. L'Heureux ('725) shows a hull with a bottom that transitions form a channel to a flat bottom.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Andrew D. Wright at telephone number (703) 308-6841. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:00 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, S. Joe Morano, can be reached at (703) 308-0230. The fax number for

Art Unit: 3617

official communications is 703-872-9306. The fax number directly to the examiner for unofficial communications is 703-746-3548.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew D. Wright Patent Examiner Art Unit 3617

A 5/27/34